

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1ERCE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,013	04/12/2004	Stephen Michael McMahon	822.173	4688
7590 08/13/2004 Levisohn, Berger & Langsam LLP 19th Floor			EXAMINER RAEVIS, ROBERT R	
New York, NY	10022		2856	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/823,013	MCMAHON, STEPHEN MICHAEL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert R. Raevis	2856				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	·					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 8,9 and 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6,7,10 and 12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) <u>5</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.				
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· ·					
application from the International Bureau	•	· ·				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Do	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	aton Application (FTO-152)				

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

___.

species of the claimed invention: Figures 1-5B, or Figure 6.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration

of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the

elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably

distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the

case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over

the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 2856

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Negrin on 8-1-04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Figures 1-5B, claims 1-7,10,12.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 8,9,11 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Figure 7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3,10,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Schellin.

Taylor teaches a materials tester that employs an analyzer assembly 14 and vacuum tube 102 whose rearward end connects to a vacuum source.

Taylor does not illustrate use of a coupling device.

As to claims 1-3,10,12, it would have been obvious to employ Schellin's coupling device (Figure 1) to permit for a plurality of tubes to be connected together to provide sufficient length to sample/analyze material from a depth of interest. Schellin's coupling device (Figure 1) includes a housing B having a bore and groove; interfacer A having a shank, shoulder and annular flange a on the shank; and resilient member D.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Schellin as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Brekke.

As to claim 4, it would have been obvious to employ a ball assembly with Schellins's coupling as Brekke teaches (Figure 11) that a ball will permit for a test element 37c to be securely attached within a line 196c. Such an assembly requires a straight groove in the interior element for the ball to recess therein.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Schellin as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Barr.

As to claims 6,7, it would have been obvious to employ a gasket with interior positioned spring as Schellin's gasket as Bar teaches that use of a spring permits for fluid conduits to be sealingly wedged together.

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sporre teaches conduits that have gripping surfaces for a seal 22.

Art Unit: 2856

Allen, Jr et al's hardness tester has on O-ring 28 in Figure 2.

Webster et al's hardness tester has an O-ring 80.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 571-272-2204. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RAZVIS